Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/716,646	VILLEFRANCE ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	MARCUS R. SMITH	2419		
All Participants:	Status of Application: 71/RCE after final rejection			
(1) MARCUS R. SMITH.	(3) <u>DAVID WARREN</u> .			
(2) <u>GREGORY B SEFCHECK</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>10 December 2008</u>	Time: <u>10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM</u>			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:				
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed:  1  Prior art documents discussed:				
Deml (US 6,996,126)				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>				
$(A_{]}$	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)	

Application No. 10/716,646

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner request to speak with attorney in order to have a better understanding of the applicant claimed invention. After listening and speaking with the attorney, it was conclude that the office and applicant have a different view on the applicant's claimed invention. The examiner disagree with the applicant's attorney about how Deml fails to teaches claim 1.